UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

District of New Mexico

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V.

Judgment in a Criminal Case (For **Revocation** of Probation or Supervised Release)

Antonio Aguilera-Alvarez a/k/a Jesus Roberto Ortega Gomez

Case Number: 1:10CR00065-001

USM Number: 19179-079

Defense Attorney: Ed Bustamante, Appointed

THE DEFEN	NDANT:		
The defendar	nt is adjudicated guilty of these violations:		
Violation Number	Nature of Violation	Violation Ended	
1	MC-The defendant committed another	Sederal, state, or local crime 07/24/2009	
The defendar Reform Act of		h 3 of this judgment. The sentence is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing	
☐ The defe	endant has not violated condition(s) and is	discharged as to such violation(s).	
name, residen	nce, or mailing address until all fines, restitu	ify the United States attorney for this district within 30 days of any change cition, costs, and special assessments imposed by this judgment are fully paid ourt and United States attorney of material changes in economic circumstance.	
None		January 11, 2011	
Last Four Digits of Defendant's Soc. Sec. No.		Date of Imposition of Judgment	
1960		/s/ James O. Browning	
Defendant's Year of Birth		Signature of Judge	
Chihuahua , MX		Honorable James O. Browning United States District Judge	
City and Star	te of Defendant's Residence	Name and Title of Judge	
		February 1, 2011	

AO 245D (Rev. 12/10) Judgment in a Criminal Case for Revocations

Sheet 2 Imprisonment Judgment Page 2 of 3

Defendant: **Antonio Aguilera-Alvarez** Case Number: **1:10CR00065-001**

IMPRISONMENT

The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of 21 months.

Said term shall run concurrently to the sentence imposed in 2:09CR02954-001 JB.

Although advisory, the Court has considered the Guidelines and, in arriving at its sentence, has taken account of the Guidelines with other sentencing goals. Specifically, the Court has considered the Guidelines` sentencing range established for the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of Defendant. The Court believes that the Guidelines` punishment is appropriate for this sort of offense. Therefore, the sentence in this judgment is consistent with a guideline sentence. The Court has considered the kind of sentence and range established by the Guidelines. The Court believes that a sentence of 21 months reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, provides just punishment, affords adequate deterrence, protects the public and effectively provides the Defendant with needed education or vocational training and medical care, and otherwise fully reflects each of the factors embodied in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a). The Court also believes the sentence is reasonable. The Court believes the sentence is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in the Sentencing Reform Act.

	The court makes these recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons:
	The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal. The defendant shall surrender to the United States Marshal for this district: at on as notified by the United States Marshal. The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons: before 2 p.m. on as notified by the United States Marshal as notified by the Probation or Pretrial Services Office.
	RETURN
I hav	re executed this judgment as follows:
Defe:	ndant delivered onto to with a certified copy of this judgment.
	UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Case 1:10-cr-00065-JB Document 23 Filed 02/01/11 Page 3 of 3

By

DEPUTY UNITED STATES MARSHAL